DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 307 TM 012 107

AUTHOR Morse, Kathy; Kaemper, Jack

TITLE Chapter 1 Early Learning Program (ELP). Evaluation Report, 1985-86.

INSTITUTION Albuquerque Public Schools, NM. Planning, Research and Accountability.

PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques; *Educational Assessment; *Followup Studies; Hispanic Americans; *Parent Participation; Pilot Projects; Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Rating Scales; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS *Albuquerque Public Schools NM; *Early Learning Program; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

In 1985-86, the Albuquerque (New Mexico) Public Schools, through Chapter 1 funding, entered the final year of a 3-year pilot of Early Learning Programs (ELPs) at four sites in the district: (1) Lavaland; (2) Longfellow; (3) Tomasita; and (4) Alamosa. Four- and five-year-old children (N=272) participated in the pilot program. Seventy-five percent of the students were Hispanic. Evaluation of the program focused on program implementation, parental involvement, and a follow-up of participants. Evaluation questions were developed by the District Early Childhood Specialist, the Chapter 1 Cognitive Language Development Specialists, and the district Director of Elementary instruction in cooperation with the district evaluation specialists assigned to Chapter 1. This evaluation report presents a synopsis of information gathered over the past three years. Data were obtained via: administration of parent, teacher, school staff, principal, and coordinator/specialist questionnaires and interviews; program observation; analysis of demographic documentation and anecdotal records of children and parents; and examination of district-wide data available for participants as they moved into the regular school setting. Results indicate that both children and parents benefited from involvement with the ELPs. The Classroom Profile, the Classroom Environment Checklist, and the Early Learning Program Screening Instrument are appended. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299307

CHAPTER 1 Early Learning Program (ELP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JACK KAEMPER

KATHY MORSE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Evaluation Report 1985-86

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TM012 107

725 University, S.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

BOARD OF EDUCATION

IRA ROBINSON
President

LENORE WOLFE
Vice-President

MARY LEE MARTIN
Secretary

DIEGO GALLEGOS
Co-Chairman, Finance Committee

ED MARINSEK
Co-Chairman, Finance Committee

LEONARD DE LAYO, JR.
Member

PAULINE MARTINEZ
Member

LILLIAN C. BARNA
Superintendent

MARY K. NEBGEN
Deputy Superintendent, Instructional Services

PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Carol Robinson, Director

Sandra O'Neal, Assistant Director for Testing and Evaluation

Prepared by:

Kathy Morse
Jack Kaemper

Chapter 1 Evaluation
March, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Administrative Summary	1
Introduction	2
Program Implementation	3
Assessment of the Status of Quality Characteristics	8
Participant Follow-up	11
Summary and Conclusions	16
Appendix A: Classroom Profile	17
Appendix B: Classroom Environment Checklist	25
Appendix C: Screening Instrument	29

CHAPTER 1 EARLY LEARNING PROGRAM (ELP)

ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

- 1985-86 was the final year of a three year pilot of an Early Learning Program (ELP) for four and five-year-old children.
- Chapter 1 funded the Early Learning Program at four sites: Lavaland, Longfellow, Tomasita, and Alamosa.
- The special instructional needs of four and five-year-old children were addressed in developing the ELP curriculum, parent involvement activities, and the recommended physical environment.
- During the three year period, the four ELP locations served 272 children -- 54% boys and 46% girls.
- Upon completion of the Early Learning Program, ELP teachers felt that 69% of the children were ready for regular kindergarten classes without a need for additional instructional support services.
- Parents and school personnel (classroom teachers, principals, counselors, etc.) reported positive academic and social outcomes for ELP participants.
- Program impact was also indicated by increased parent involvement with their children and with the school.
- A follow-up study of ELP participants indicated that some of the children continue to have needs for supportive/ supplemental instruction as they move into the regular school setting.
- An assessment of the seven characteristics of a high quality early learning program indicated that for any future programs:
  - program management roles need to be clarified and refined;
  - teachers need support in the development of goals for the parent component;
  - the selection of teachers and aides should be made with consideration of the need for mutual support and cooperation;
  - the experience of the pilot staffs should be utilized;
  - a specific curriculum should be written;
  - training in the curriculum should be provided, and teachers should have early childhood certification and experience; and
  - an ongoing communication of program observations and recommendations for improvement should continue.

INTRODUCTION

In 1985-86, the Albuquerque Public Schools, through Chapter 1 funding, entered the final year of a three-year pilot of Early Learning Programs (ELPs) in the district. Four and five-year-old children (pre-kindergarten age) were eligible to participate in the pilot programs at Lavaland, Longfellow, and Tomasita, and in the established program at Alamosa, if they demonstrated needs in language development.

The purpose of piloting the Early Learning Program was to provide the district with as much experience and information as possible in order to facilitate the implementation of any future programs. The evaluation design, developed in 1983-84 at program inception, identified three specific areas for concentrated study:

1) Program Implementation,
2) Parent Involvement, and
3) A Follow-up of Program Participants.

Evaluation questions were developed by the District Early Childhood Specialist, the Chapter 1 Cognitive Language Development (CLD) program specialists, and the District Director of Elementary Instruction in cooperation with the district evaluation specialists assigned to Chapter 1. The proposed evaluation design and supporting questions were discussed with the principals and ELP teachers at the participating sites for their information and input.

This evaluation report will present a synopsis of information gathered for the past three years. Data were obtained through parent, teacher, school staff, principal, and coordinator/specialist questionnaires and interviews; by program observation; through demographic documentation and anecdotal records of participating children and parents; and by examination of district-wide data available for participants as they moved into the regular school setting.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Program Characteristics

The original program concept for the APS Early Learning Program pilot was based on the findings of a study of the Perry Preschool Project conducted by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. This study affirmed the positive impact of early schooling on later development. Research on early education programs, including the Perry Preschool Project, identified the following seven characteristics of high quality early learning programs:

1. The program is well managed and monitored.
2. Parents have substantial involvement in the child's education.
3. Teachers work in teams to provide mutual support and individual attention to children.
4. A high degree of adult-child interaction is essential.
5. The program is organized around a specific curriculum or set of principles for learning.
6. Teachers are trained in the curriculum.
7. The program is regularly assessed to assure that goals for high quality are being met.

An assessment of the status of the seven characteristics in relation to the APS Early Learning Program follows later in this report.

Program Goals

The goals of the APS Early Learning Program were:

- to provide four and five-year-old children with a conceptual foundation necessary for future learning;
- to increase children's self confidence, independence, and responsibility;
- to enhance motor skill development;
- to provide an opportunity for the development of social skills with other children and adults;
- to expand language;
- to develop organization of thought;
- to stimulate and nurture curiosity and exploration;
- to develop an awareness of literacy in the home, school, and community; and
- to provide positive experiences in the school setting.

In addition to the child-centered goals described above, program goals for the parent involvement component of the ELP were established. These goals were:

- to promote a positive parent/child relationship;
- to build and support communication and cooperation between home and school;
- to encourage parents to become involved in the child's

learning; and
- o to maintain parent involvement beyond the early years.

To address these goals, the early learning program curriculum in APS was designed to offer experiences to support the emotional, physical, intellectual, and social development of children. These experiences were provided by involving children and parents in concrete, real-life, multi-sensory activities. Children were able to pursue their natural curiosity and to take part in creative expression, cooking, dramatic play, construction, music/movement activities, the enjoyment of literature, and story telling. Activities were provided for individuals as well as groups of children. Learning was supported by children's use of materials such as blocks, sand, clay, water, mud, wood, and paint. Children were involved with both the indoor and outdoor environment. Field trips were planned to introduce youngsters to a variety of settings including the airport, zoo, grocery store, egg farm, fishing pond, fire station, veterinarian, pediatrician's office, library, museum, and the APS Career Enrichment Center. Members of the community were invited into the classroom to share their skills and interests with children and parents in order to provide additional exposure to a variety of experiences.

In addition to the development of an appropriate curriculum to meet the special instructional needs of four and five-year-old children, the program developers addressed the specific physical environment necessary for housing a program for pre-kindergarten children. It was recommended that facilities be scaled to the size and age of participating children, and that access be provided to an appropriate outdoor environment and to restrooms. Equipment recommended for the outdoor environment included a climbing apparatus; things in which to go over-under-in-out-around; a sand box with tools for digging, filling, measuring and building; and toys to ride, push, and pull.

Participant Data -- Three Year Summary

Specific questions under the heading of Program Implementation took into account information about participating children, as well as program issues. The ELP teachers kept records designed to answer the following participant-related questions:

Q1. HOW MANY CHILDREN RECEIVED SERVICE?
Over the three years of the pilot program, 272 children participated in the Early Learning Program at the four sites.

Q2. WHAT WAS THE AGE RANGE OF THE PARTICIPATING CHILDREN?
The average age at time of entry into the program was 4 years, 7 months. The youngest child in the program

was 4; the oldest was 5 years, 9 months.

Q3. WHAT WAS THE ETHNIC MAKEUP OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS?

Hispanic	= 75%
Anglo	= 14%
Native American	= 3%
Black	= 3%
Asian	= 3%
Other	= 2%

Q4. WHAT WAS THE SEX OF THE PARTICIPANTS?

Male	= 54%
Female	= 46%

Q5. WHAT WAS THE FAMILY STRUCTURE?
The majority of the children (70%) lived with both parents; 15% lived with mother only; 7% resided in an extended family setting; 3% lived with one parent and a significant other; 1% lived with father only; 1% with grandparents; 1% in a foster home; 1% with other relatives; and 1% in a home other than with relatives.

Q6. HOW MANY SIBLINGS DID THE PARTICIPANT(S) HAVE?
Thirty-three of the youngsters (12%) were the only child in the family, while the rest of the children had from one to six siblings.

Q7. WHERE DID THE CHILDREN SPEND THE REST OF THE DAY WHEN THEY WERE NOT ATTENDING ELP?
Most of the children (84%) spent the remainder of the day at home, either with parent(s) or other family members.

Q8. WHAT WAS THE RECOMMENDATION MADE BY THE ELP TEACHER FOR THE CHILDREN'S PLACEMENT THE FOLLOWING YEAR?
The majority of the children (69%) were seen as prepared for the regular kindergarten program with no additional intervention required. For 19% of the youngsters, the support of the Chapter 1 Cognitive Language Development (CLD) program was recommended to supplement their regular kindergarten experience. Eight percent (8%) of the children showed a need for support services other than CLD, in addition to the regular kindergarten program. For ten children (4%), a repeat of the ELP program was recommended.

Program Issues

The other program implementation evaluation questions addressed the integration of ELP at each of the sites, both operationally and with other support services; the status of space and facilities; effective materials; staffing; and staff inservice.

During the first year (1983-84) of the pilot project, an external evaluator, with an extensive background in early childhood education, spent many hours at each ELP site observing the projects. The evaluator designed two observation forms to provide structure to all of the information being gathered at each school. The Classroom Profile provided a means of quantifying, by use of a rating scale, the activities being conducted in each classroom. Specific areas assessed were:

- o Gross Motor Activities
- o Logical Reasoning
- o Understanding Space and Time
- o Creative Activities
- o Active Learning
- o Representing Experiences and Ideas
- o Using Language
- o Development of Self
- o Child Observation
- o Child Protection

The rating scale ranged from 1 (inadequate) to 6 (excellent). A definitive statement for each rating within each area was included in the instrument. Appendix A contains a copy of the Classroom Profile assessment tool.

The second observation tool designed by the external evaluator was the Classroom Environment Checklist. This checklist provided detailed descriptions of the classroom settings essential for the conduct of the Early Learning Program, including activity areas, interest centers, materials, and equipment. A copy of this document can be found in Appendix B.

The process evaluation which was conducted during 1983-84 and continued into the first semester of 1984-85, laid the groundwork for the program evaluation which followed. All information gathered was discussed with the ELP teachers, principals, and program administrators in order to respond to recommendations for program changes and improvements as quickly as possible. Needs which surfaced regarding space, equipment, and materials were attended to, when possible, as soon as they were identified through the process evaluation. Data gathered during the ELP pilot years were used for learning, communicating, and improving.

Participant Selection

The development of an adequate screening instrument for participant selection was one of the needs identified during the first year of the ELP pilot. As word of the program spread throughout the school communities, applicants for attendance exceeded the number of children who could be served by the projects. Since the program was funded by

Chapter 1, the selection of participants had to be based on documentation of who had the most need for the program.

The ELP teachers, in consultation with the Chapter 1 CLD program specialists and the district Early Childhood Coordinator, developed a screening instrument which allowed the teachers to screen and rate all children who applied to the program. Each child's performance/behavior was observed and rated by the ELP staff in the areas of verbalization, organization of talk, social behavior, interaction with children, interaction with adults, following directions, interactions with materials and tools, evidence of previous experience with common inside and outside materials, attention to visual stimuli, spatial awareness, and self confidence. Children with the lowest total ratings were selected for the program. A copy of the screening instrument can be found in Appendix C.

Staff Development

The area of staff development for the Early Learning Program teachers and aides continued to be problematic during the three year pilot. While ELP was funded by Chapter 1, and placed under the supervision of the program specialists assigned to the Chapter 1 CLD program, the attempt to integrate the program into the operational program introduced more administrative staffing (District Director of Elementary Instruction, District Early Childhood Coordinator) in addition to the site principals. ELP teachers seemed to want staff inservice/staff development planned around their unique in-classroom needs, while administrators often saw the need for providing support to the philosophical base of the program. The ELP teaching staff indicated that they could learn a great deal from each other's successes (and failures), yet seemed to feel that this opportunity was not afforded them as frequently as they would have liked.

One of the purposes of piloting the program was to iron out the wrinkles so that future programs could be replicated with ease. The lesson learned here was that staff development and teacher planning time are crucial, and should be planned to accommodate the expressed needs of the ELP teaching staff.

Achievement of Goals

All of the groups involved in the assessment of the ELP (parents, classroom teachers, counselors, principals, support personnel) reported positive academic and social outcomes for the participating children.

Parents reported observed improvement in their children's social development, such as growth in self confidence, independence, responsibility, and getting along with others. In language and literacy development, parents cited

children's improved speech, increased vocabulary, enjoyment of reading and writing, lengthened attention span, and recognition of letters/colors/numbers/words/names as evidence of program impact. Parents also noted improvement in their children's physical development, such as using scissors/ blocks/puzzles, running and climbing, buttoning and tying. Parents described enthusiastically and appreciatively the effects of the ELP program on their children.

School staff members saw program benefits reflected by children's increased self confidence, eagerness for learning, responsibility, independence, and positive attitude toward school. This group felt that the Early Learning Program would contribute to future school and life successes for participating youngsters.

Each of the groups reported evidence of the effects of the program on participating parents. Increased parent sensitivity to their children's needs, increased parent involvement with their children, and more parent involvement with the school were cited as indicants of program impact.

Assessment of the Status of the Quality Characteristics

At the end of the three year ELP pilot, each of the characteristics of a quality program endorsed by the High/Scope Education Research Foundation was examined in relationship to the APS early learning project. An assessment of their status follows.

1. THE PROGRAM IS WELL MANAGED AND MONITORED.

The consensus of opinion was that the Early Learning Program had been fairly well monitored and managed. Some concerns were expressed regarding program management, particularly at the beginning of the program when various aspects of the program administration were in the hands of the school principals, the Chapter 1 CLD program specialists, the District Early Childhood Coordinator, and the District Elementary Director. The ELP teachers had some difficulty determining who was in charge of what, and who should be contacted in any given situation.

As the program evolved, clarification of administrative roles took place and there seemed to be a better defined chain of command. However, even by the end of the third year of the pilot, this still seemed to be an area of need. Those involved in the program suggest that, ideally, there should be a project coordinator, under the direction of the District Early Childhood Coordinator, who would be responsible for program implementation, monitoring, and maintenance.

2. PARENTS HAVE SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHILD'S EDUCATION.

By all indications, the parent component was successful at all four ELP sites. Each project approached parent involvement in somewhat different ways based on the strengths and styles of the ELP teacher, aides, and principals. Some features were common to all sites, such as group meetings, parent involvement in the classrooms, and home visits. From site to site, differences were seen in the stated purpose of parent involvement. As a result, it is suggested that teachers receive more support in the development of goals for parent involvement, while maintaining the flexibility for achievement of the goals.

Parents were extremely positive about the impact of the program on their children and on themselves. They felt that their parenting skills were enhanced by the modeling of the ELP teachers and aides, and saw a carryover effect in their interaction with other children in the family. They felt comfortable and welcome in the school setting, and reported giant strides in their children's development.

3. TEACHERS WORK IN TEAMS TO PROVIDE MUTUAL SUPPORT AND INDIVIDUAL ATTENTION TO CHILDREN.

The success of the teaming element varied between project sites from year to year, due to changes in personnel. Based on experiences in the pilot project, it is apparent that teaming should be made a priority if the program is to be successful. The selection of teacher and aide should be made with an awareness of the need for support and cooperation. It is crucial that the right match be made in order to provide children with quality language and behavior modeling. Involving the ELP teacher in selecting the ELP aide might be considered.

Teaming beyond the confines of the ELP classroom was also observed in varying degrees from site to site. These observations indicate that the integration of the Early Learning Program with other school resources, and communication between the ELP staff and other support personnel enhance the effectiveness of all aspects of the program for participating children.

4. A HIGH DEGREE OF ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION IS ESSENTIAL, WITH THE CHILD INITIATING MUCH OF THE ACTIVITY.

Classroom observation provided evidence that this was an area that showed growth over the three years of the pilot program. As teachers learned through their experiences, the quality and quantity of child initiated adult-child interaction increased. The involvement of parents in the classroom also contributed to this part of the program. Since this was an

area in which teachers learned by doing, ELP teachers would be an invaluable source for assisting in staff development activities for any future programs.

5. THE PROGRAM IS ORGANIZED AROUND A SPECIFIC CURRICULUM OR SET OF PRINCIPLES FOR LEARNING.

The Early Learning Program had a rather loose curriculum, and although there were common goals and activities, there were differences between sites in the use of methods and materials. The ELP teachers' articulation of their perceptions of the curriculum were very much the same. Given the experience of the pilot project, it appears that teachers and principals are now ready to write the curriculum with common goals, philosophy, and themes, while leaving adequate room for variability and flexibility.

6. TEACHERS ARE TRAINED IN THE CURRICULUM.

Since the curriculum was evolving and emerging throughout the pilot, teachers were central to the entire process. Teachers were intensely involved in the development of the curriculum through interaction with children and parents, with resource people, and with each other. The dynamics of this process were sometimes frustrating and fraught with growing pains, but at the conclusion of the three-year pilot there were positive feelings about the outcome.

The need for training in the curriculum remains a priority in planning any future early learning programs. Teachers selected for the program should have early childhood certification and some experience working with four and five-year-old children.

7. THE PROGRAM IS REGULARLY ASSESSED TO ASSURE THAT GOALS FOR HIGH QUALITY ARE BEING MET.

The program was assessed at the school level as well as at the district level. The ELP teachers, principals, Chapter 1 program specialists, early childhood coordinator, district evaluators, and outside resource people all examined various aspects of the projects in depth. The findings were used to modify and/or improve the program on a continual basis. The success of this approach in the pilot project would indicate that the communication of observations and recommendations is extremely important in order to provide assurance of high quality programs.

PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP

The evaluation plan developed at the beginning of the APS three-year ELP pilot included a participant follow-up component. The intent of the follow-up was to see how participating children progressed as they moved into the regular school setting. The following information is based on information available in 1985-86 for children who had participated in the Early Learning Program during the 1983-84 and 1984-85 school years.

Children in the Follow-up Population

The table below provides an overview of the numbers of children who were served by ELP in 1983-84 and 1984-85, and how many of those students had data available at the end of the 1985-86 school year.

YEAR IN ELP	# SVD.	#LOCATED	# WITH ASSESSMENT DATA 85-86	#REFERRED TO SP.ED. 1985-86	NUMBER CH.1 ELIGIBLE 85-86	NUMBER CH.1 ELIGIBLE 86-87
1983-84	96	76	52 (CTBS*)	15	29	33
1984-85	89	77	62 (KDPR^)	4	19	29
TOTAL	185	153	114	19	48	62

* CTBS - Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills
^ KDPR - Kindergarten Developmental Progress Record

The 153 children who could be located in APS represented 83% of the population originally participating in the first two years of the ELP. Of those 153 students, 114 (75%) had assessment data available.

The children who took part in the program in 1983-84 were first graders in 1985-86. If they were attending an elementary school with a Chapter 1 program, they had the opportunity to take the CTBS at the end of the first grade. CTBS data were obtainable for 52 (68%) of the 76 children who were still in the district.

Children who attended the program in 1984-85 were in kindergarten in 1985-86, and the Kindergarten Developmental Progress Record (KDPR) was located for 62 (81%) of the 77 youngsters who, according to available records, were attending APS.

Special Education Referral Data

A total of 19 children who had been enrolled in the Early Learning Program had been referred to Special Education at the end of the 1985-86 school year. Of the 153 children who

could be located, this number represents 12%. Following is a breakdown of the Special Education placement of these youngsters as of the end of 1985-86.

- A Level = 1
- B Level = 5
- D Level = 5
- Articulation only = 1
- No placement as of 5/86 = 7

Chapter 1 Referral Data

A child becomes eligible for Chapter 1 Reading or Cognitive Language Development (CLD) supplemental programs if, in the judgement of the classroom teacher, the child's reading skill development or reading readiness skills are below average. In 1985-86, 48 children (29 first graders and 19 kindergarten children) who had been ELP participants were placed on the Chapter 1 masterlist of eligible children. This represented 31% of the 153 ELP participants for whom data were available. A total of 40 of the 48 children did, in fact, receive Chapter 1 instruction in 1985-86 (23 first graders and 17 kindergarteners).

For the 1986-87 school year, 62 of the original 153 children (41%) who had been in ELP have been identified as needing Chapter 1 service. Data have not yet been compiled as to how many of the students are currently being served.

1985-86 First Graders' CTBS Data (1983-84 ELP Participants)

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Level C, is administered in March of the school year to all first grade students attending elementary schools with Chapter 1 programs. The tests measure word attack skills, reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, language expression, math computation, and math concepts and applications. The Total Reading score is a combination of the performances in reading vocabulary and reading comprehension. The Total Math score reflects the performances in math computation and math concepts/applications.

The following chart shows the normal distribution for stanine performances. In a normal distribution, 23% of the population will fall in the "below average" stanine range of 1, 2, or 3; 54% of the population will fall in the "average" stanine range of 4, 5, or 6; and 23% of the population will have scores which place them in the "above average" stanine range of 7, 8, or 9.

1985-86 CTBS PERFORMANCES FOR ELP PARTICIPANTS
AND FOR ALL GRADE 1 STUDENTS AT CHAPTER 1 SCHOOLS
COMPARED TO THE NORMAL STANINE DISTRIBUTION

	STANINES 1-3 BELOW AVERAGE 23%		STANINES 4-6 AVERAGE 54%		STANINES 7-9 ABOVE AVERAGE 23%	
	ELP	ALL GR.1	ELP	ALL GR.1	ELP	ALL GR.1
WORD ATTACK	35%	26%	60%	56%	6%	8%
RDG. VOCABULARY	31%	22%	56%	62%	13%	17%
RDG. COMPREHENSION	33%	24%	52%	60%	15%	17%
LANGUAGE EXPRESSION	31%	21%	57%	56%	12%	23%
MATH COMPUTATION	23%	20%	46%	52%	31%	28%
MATH CONCEPTS/APPL.	12%	10%	55%	52%	33%	37%
READING TOTAL	35%	25%	52%	60%	13%	15%
MATH TOTAL	16%	16%	55%	52%	29%	32%

The percentages of the 52 former ELP students who scored within the three stanine bands are listed in the three columns. For example, 35% of the children's scores in the Word Attack subtest were in the "below average" range (stanines 1, 2, and 3); 60% of the scores were in the "average" range (stanines 4, 5, and 6); and 6% of the group had stanines in the "above average" range (stanines 7, 8, and 9). Also listed are the March, 1986 CTBS stanine percentages for over 2900 first graders tested at APS Chapter 1 elementary schools.

Both the ELP group and the All Grade 1 group performed extremely well on the math portions of the CTBS. Compared to the normal distribution, fewer APS youngsters scored below average, and more scored above average than would have been expected.

The ELP group did not perform as well as the All Grade 1 group on the reading portions of the CTBS, and the All Grade 1 group had a smaller percent of students scoring above average in reading than might have been expected.

In language expression, the All Grade 1 group approximated the normal distribution, while the ELP participants did less well.

1985-86 Kindergarten Developmental Progress Record Data (1984-85 ELP Participants)

The table on the next page shows the number and percent of 1984-85 ELP participants who in January, 1986 were assessed by their kindergarten teachers as demonstrating a need for more time/instruction or as having an area of special need in any of the categories listed on the Kindergarten Developmental Progress Record (KDPR). Kindergarten Developmental Progress Records were accessible for 62 of the children who attended ELP in 1984-85.

Under the column headed "ALL K" is the percent of the 6079 kindergarten children throughout the district who were assessed as needing more time/experience or as demonstrating an area of special need.

1985-86 KINDERGARTEN DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRESS RECORD (KDPR)

Areas Assessed	NUMBER AND PERCENT NEEDS MORE TIME/EXPERIENCE OR AREA OF SPECIAL NEED	
AFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENT	ELP	ALL K
Shows self-confidence	5 (8%)	(8%)
Appears to enjoy school	0	(1%)
Explores new ideas, information, situations	2 (3%)	(8%)
Exhibits curiosity	2 (3%)	(5%)
Shows initiative in planning/decisions/ choices/problem solving	3 (5%)	(16%)
Follows through on tasks	3 (5%)	(13%)
Assumes responsibility for self/environment	4 (6%)	(12%)
Plays/works cooperatively	4 (6%)	(8%)
Respects/cares about feelings of others	4 (6%)	(7%)
PSYCHOMOTOR DEVELOPMENT		
Indicates physical well-being	3 (5%)	(5%)
Exhibits large muscle coordination	2 (3%)	(6%)
Uses body to respond to directional words	5 (8%)	(13%)
Follows beat, rhythm, patterns, sequences in music/movement experiences	4 (6%)	(10%)
Exhibits small muscle/eye-hand coordination	3 (5%)	(15%)
Reproduces patterns, designs, symbols	2 (3%)	(14%)
COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT		
Relates ideas/experiences in formal/informal settings	6 (10%)	(14%)
Developing complexity in verbal expression	7 (11%)	(15%)
Recalls sequences/patterns	4 (6%)	(12%)
Represents ideas in pictorial or symbolic form using a variety of tools/art	2 (3%)	(10%)
Recognizes/identifies print in school/ community settings	8 (13%)	(21%)
Notices likenesses, differences, details	3 (5%)	(15%)
Distinguishes sounds	6 (10%)	(15%)
Developing sound/symbol relationships	19 (31%)	(32%)
Shows enthusiasm for reading/being read to	0	(4%)
Actively engaged in the process of reading	4 (6%)	(13%)
Shows a sense of humor	0	(4%)
Processes information	5 (8%)	(15%)
Uses scientific processes/critical thinking skills	13 (21%)	(22%)
Exercises creativity and imagination	7 (11%)	(13%)
Explores and generalizes through multi-sensory experiences	6 (10%)	(7%)
Builds with developing complexity using a variety of materials	1 (2%)	(7%)
Classifies and organizes materials	2 (3%)	(12%)
Uses number concepts	16 (26%)	(23%)
Uses measurements to make comparisons	8 (13%)	(21%)
Developing an awareness of other cultures	0	(5%)
Developing sensitivity to interdependence of living/non-living things	5 (8%)	(8%)

On eighteen areas of the KDPR, the percentage of former ELP students identified by their kindergarten teachers as demonstrating instructional needs was five or more percentage points less than the total kindergarten group. These items are indicated by the bold print.

This follow-up of ELP participants was not intended to establish any programatic cause/effect relationship, but simply to see how the youngsters fared as they moved into the regular school setting. We cannot say how these children would have been assessed on the Kindergarten Developmental Progress Record or how they would have performed on the CTBS had they not had the program; nor can we say what percent of the children would have been referred to Special Education or would have become eligible for Chapter 1 services if they had not had the program.

What we can deduce from the information gathered is that, although there are implicit benefits for children who participated in the Early Learning Program's enriching experiences, some of the children continue to have needs for supportive/supplemental instruction as they move into the regular school setting.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The intent of the three-year pilot of the Early Learning Program was to provide the Albuquerque Public Schools with experience and information relative to the feasibility and success of such an approach to young children's instructional and developmental needs. The source of the funding for the program was Chapter 1; therefore, the target population had to be children who demonstrated a need for educational intervention in order to help them "catch up" with their peers. The data gathered to assess the success of the program indicate that both children and parents benefitted from their involvement with the ELP.

During this school year (1986-87), two of the four sites involved in the pilot evaluation decided to use part of their Chapter 1 resource allocation to continue funding the ELP. This decision was not made lightly, for the selection of ELP meant the elimination of some other types of Chapter 1 service to children. The other two schools chose not to fund the program and give up existing Chapter 1 service to children, but hope for the day when their Chapter 1 resource allocation will be substantial enough to allow them to reinstate the program.

Much of the information gathered regarding the requisites for an early learning program curriculum, facilities, staffing, and materials was used to implement a Title VII-funded bilingual Early Learning Program at three elementary sites (East San Jose, Eugene Field, and Valle Vista) in 1986-87.

A P P E N D I X A

Classroom Profile

APS Chapter 1 CLD Pre-Kindergarten Pilot Programs

CLASSROOM PROFILE

The classroom profile presents a view of the activities of the individual classroom on a scale of 1 to 6. There are four levels to be included in the continuim:

Inadequate 1 — Minimal 2 3 — Good 4 5 — Excellent 6

The items listed under 4 and 5 (good) are also included in 6 (excellent)

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
GROSS MOTOR				
Space				1 2 3 4 5 6
No outdoor space set aside specifically for gross motor and physical play.	Some space indoors or outside for gross motor development.	Adequate space and equipment with safety precaution observed.	Planned space in and out for gross motor activity. Provision for a variety of activities - sand - growing things - climbing.	
Equipment				1 2 3 4 5 6
Little or poorly repaired equipment.	Some equipment seldom used.	Some equipment available: sand - climbing etc. to stimulate a number of developmental gross motor skills.	A variety of large muscle materials for social and physical activities sand - climbing riding wheel toys growing things.	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
CREATIVE ACTIVITIES				
Music				1 2 3 4 5 6
No special provision made for music or movement activities.	Some activities planned but not on a regular basis.	Planned activities in music and movement several times a week.	Instruments, recordings and space for movement available during self selection times.	
Art				1 2 3 4 5 6
Few art materials available. Those that are used with teacher directions or patterns.	Materials available but usually for planned projects.	Materials: Varieties of paper, paste, scissors, paints, crayons available. Self selection encouraged. Some adult examples of projects.	Additional material available: clay, easels, collage materials, wood creativity, self selection encouraged.	
Blocks				1 2 3 4 5 6
Few assorted blocks available. Not enough space for construction.	Blocks and space for only two children. Limited accessories.	Special block area for building - out of main traffic pattern. Large enough for 3-4 children. Accessories - cars - animals - and people available.	Various sizes, shapes of blocks and designated storage spaces. Other materials, fabrics, cans, etc. for imaginative construction. Time for building.	
Fluid Materials				1 2 3 4 5 6
Little evidence of regular opportunities to explore and use fluid materials - paint, clay, sand, blocks, dramatic play in a creative "playful" way.	Opportunities provided for self selection in block areas, dramatic play. Some time for creative activities but mostly with paints, crayons or patterned activities.	Opportunities provided for "messing around" with paints, cutting and pasting, sand and water.	Opportunities for playing with all of the materials with free use of the imagination and creative ideas. Extension of ideas through conversation, interaction and exposure to new ideas and experiences.	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
ACTIVE LEARNING				1 2 3 4 5 6
Teacher directed activities at all times.	Limited opportunities to explore, discover, and choose activities at only certain times of the day . Directed activies for skills development.	Many opportunities for choosing, discovering and exploring. Opportunities for large muscle activities. Guidance in developing small muscle skills. Stories read - tapes and records available with stories and music.	Opportunities for creative manipulating,transforming, combining of materials. Developing responsibility for own needs and care of equipment. Teacher plans many experiences to build knowledge and thinking.	
REPRESENTING EXPERIENCES AND IDEAS				1 2 3 4 5 6
Little opportunity for child to produce own ideas.	Recognizes objects by sound, touch taste or smell.	Relates pictures, photographs, models to real places and things. Role playing.	Imitates actions. Makes models with clay, blocks, etc. Creative drawing, painting and projects.	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
USING LANGUAGE				
Receptive				1 2 3 4 5 6
Few opportunities to listen or hear language other than the teachers.	Opportunity to hear stories once a day.	Many opportunities during the day to hear language, stories, tapes and records. Teacher gives clear presise directions.	Teacher models language in directions, expansion of meaning and experiences. Provision for parents and/or older students to read stories.	
Expressive				1 2 3 4 5 6
Few opportunities for production of child's language.	Opportunities to: describe objects, events and relationships. Communicate freely with adults and children.	Child talks with others about personal feelings and experiences. Child shares and uses games to express self in language and concepts.	Child has own language written, displayed and read back. Child has fun with language, poems, stories, etc. Teacher models expressive language all day.	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
DEVELOPMENT OF SELF				1 2 3 4 5 6
Scheduling throughout the day offers little opportunity to explore or seek answers independently.	Opportunities are provided for new experiences and exposure to new materials.	Opportunities are provided for the child to be responsible for self; to chose materials and activities; to try out, on their own, new activities and experiences.	Opportunities are provided for the child to make decisions; share ideas with others (children and adults); verbalize experiences, stories and ideas; demonstrate independent problem solving abilities.	
OBSERVATION OF CHILDREN				1 2 3 4 5 6
Brief notes on children with problems.	Brief irregular notes on all children, usually subjective in nature.	Notes on all children on a regular basis. The observations are objective and based on objective information.	Observation information is used to assess the child's growth and needs. This is shared by teacher, teacher aide, and parent.	
PROTECTION OF CHILDREN				1 2 3 4 5 6
Observation of possible child abuse.	Teachers are aware of possible signs of child abuse.	Teachers make sure outdoor and indoor environment are safe for children.	Teacher provides safe opportunities for a child to develop individual initative, problem solving, and thinking abilities.	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
LOGICAL REASONING				
Classification- Numbers - Seriation				1 2 3 4 5 6
Little opportunity for independent activities for children. There are few materials for sorting.	Some opportunities for investigation and labeling of attribute of things for sorting, matching and comparing. Opportunity to compare size and amounts (more - less, big - little, tall - short.)	Opportunities for child to sort and describe objects in a variety of ways (large - small, tall - short, dark - light.) Opportunities to sort and/or arrange a variety of objects and materials. Enumerate objects. (not rote counting). Child determines criteria for sorting.	Opportunities to determine more than one attribute (wood and red). Begin 1-1 correspondance (2 cookies for 2 children).	

1 Inadequate	2 3 Minimal	4 5 Good	6 Excellent	Rating (Circle Appropriate Number)
UNDERSTANDING SPACE AND TIME				
Spatial Relations				1 2 3 4 5 6
Opportunities for only simple puzzles and taking apart and putting together materials	Opportunities for rearranging objects in space (fold, twist, stack, stretch, tie). Experience and describe position of things in relation to each other (over, under, beside, middle)	Opportunities to experience and describe movement of things to people (close to, near, next to). Experience and represent one's own body - how it's structured, it's parts and functions. Distinguish and describe shapes.	Opportunities to locate things in class, school and neighborhood. Interpret representation of spatial relations in drawings and pictures.	
Understanding time units or intervals				1 2 3 4 5 6
Start or stop on signal.	Experience and describe different rates of movement.	Opportunities to compare time periods (short - long, old - young, little while - long time.)	Will observe: seasons, clocks and calander used to mark passage of time.	
Sequencing events and time				1 2 3 4 5 6
Litte or no opportunity to aware of time as a unit.	Notice, describe and represent order of events (day's schedule)	Opportunities to: Anticipate and plan for future events. Describe and represent post events.	Plan and complete what one has planned. Use conventional terms to describe post and future events. (morning, yesterday)	

A P P E N D I X B

Classroom Environment Checklist

APS Chapter 1 CLD Pre-Kindergarten Pilot Programs

1983-84

Classroom Environment Checklist

	Tomasita	Longfellow	Lavaland	Alamosa
1. THE ROOM IS DIVIDED INTO DISTINCT WELL DEFINED AREAS OR INTEREST CENTERS:				
. Dramatic play - Art - block building - quiet work space - relaxation spot - sand/water - music and movement - animals and plants.				
. Shelves or storage space to define the boundaries.				
. Proper work space is provided in an uncluttered area.				
2. MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT ARE STORED IN THE AREA WHERE THEY ARE TO BE USED:				
. Storage spaces labeled with pictures, objects or outlines of materials				
. Materials are easily accessible to children				
. Materials are stored in a logically organized manner (Art materials near the art work areas)				
. Materials give messages to children regarding activities in a given area.				
3. PROVISIONS FOR THE ACTIVITY AREAS:				
. Block Area				
Unit Blocks				
Accessory equipment for imaginary play				
Varieties of other building materials (tin cans - styrofoam - fabric)				
. Dramatic Play Area				
Materials for sorting - filling - storing				
Materials for real cooking				
Materials for dramatic play - changed to fit the focus of the curriculum				
Material for role playing				
Adequate storage space				

	Tomasita	Longfellow	Lavaland	Alamosa
. Art Area				
Materials appropriate and accessable to children for the necessary large and small muscle development (easels - large brushes - tempera paint)				
Paper of various sizes, shapes, color, and textures				
Materials for recording - crayons, magic markers - pencils				
Materials for putting things together paste - tape - staples - brads, etc.)				
Smocks or aprons easily available and stored				
Drying space for paintings				
Storage space for work in progress				
Materials constantly renewed and monitored				
. Quiet Areas				
Materials to sort - order - fit together and take apart (buttons - Lego Blocks - puzzles - small games, etc.)				
Materials for encoding and decoding, creating				
Books - to be renewed and changed, kept up to date				
Stored with the front cover facing the room				
Stored in many areas of the room				
. Music and movement				
Record player and/or cassette player				
Records and/or tapes available				
Instruments labeled and stored				
Space for movement activities				

	Tomasita	Longfellow	Lavaland	Alamosa
. Sand and/or water space				
Proper container for sand or water				
Materials for scooping - digging - measuring - pouring				
Materials for dramatic play - cars, trucks etc.				
Materials to encourage science activities - measuring equipment - soap for bubbles, etc.				
Cleanable floor surface				
. Plant and animals				
Easily cared for plants to care for and observe				
Appropriate containers and food for animals				
Friendly, safe animals				
. Material available to				
Climb on and under - balance on - jump over				
swing on				
kick - throw - push - pull or ride on				
build with				
Sand and/or water play				
4. PHYSICAL FACILITY				
School provides:				
Sufficient space				
Running water				
Bathrooms (interior - adjacent or near the room)				
Adequate storage space for teacher and children				
Equipment for cooking				

A P P E N D I X C

Screening Instrument

EARLY LEARNING PROGRAM SCREENING INSTRUMENT

CHILD'S NAME_____ PARENT'S NAME_____

BIRTHDATE_____ ADDRESS_____

AGE_____ DATE_____

OBSERVOR_____

PARAMETERS TO OBSERVE:

	RANGE OF RESPONSE					
	NOT OBS	1=NEED	2=POOR	3=FAIR	4=AVE	5=STREN
1. Verbalization						
2. Organization of Talk						
3. Social Behavior						
4. Interaction With Children						
5. Interaction With Adults						
6. Follows Directions						
7. Interaction with Materials & Tools						
8. Evidence of Previous Experience with Common Materials, Inside & Out						
9. Attention to Visual Stimuli (stories & pictures), unusual objects						
10. Spatial Awareness						
11. Self Confidence						

TOTAL_____

GRAND TOTAL_____

COMMENTS:

Early Learning Program Screening Instrument

Observable Criteria

1. Verbalization
   - talks a lot
   - initiates talk
   - responds verbally
   - responds non-verbally
   - doesn't talk/respond
   - articulation/clarity

2. Organization of Talk and Play
   - sentence organization
   - coherence of conversation
   - vocabulary/labeling
   - carries on simple conversation
   - how materials are organized/utilized during play
   - imagination/creativity with language

3. Social Behavior
   - able to handle group situations
   - interactive/parallel play
   - very negative
   - negative
   - concerned
   - average
   - strength

4. Interaction with Children
   - leader/initiator
   - follower
   - observer

5. Interaction with Adults
   - initiates interaction
   - response to adult(s) (verbal/nonverbal)
   - does not respond
   - can be coaxed

6. Follows Directions
   - stays with group activity
   - responds to requests
   - follows through on requests

7. Interaction with Materials & Tools
   - organization of play
   - indicates previous experience with materials and tools
   - knows what to do with materials/tools
   - explores variety of materials/play areas
   - peer teaching (verbal/nonverbally)

Observable Criteria Continued

8. Evidence of Previous Experience with Common Materials, Inside & Outdoors
   - indicates many experiences/few experiences
   - cautious
   - takes risks
   - creative
   - comfortable

9. Attention to Visual/Auditory Stimuli (Stories, Pictures, Objects)
   - able to attend
   - easily distracted

10. Spatial Awareness
    - body coordination (gross/fine motor)
    - body awareness

11. Self Confidence
    - separation from parents
    - risk taker/initiates activity
    - confidence with materials/tools/people
    - expresses thoughts
    - is there a difference between indoors and outdoors?